IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No.18627 of 2006

Dated: September 13, 2006

Between:

Kum. D. Phani Srilatha Devi, D/o. Satyanarayana, Aged 23 years, MBBS Part II, Rangaraya Medical College, Kakinada, East Godavari District.

... Petitioner

And

The N.T.R. University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada, Krishna District, rep. by its Registrar (Examinations).

... Respondent

Order:

This writ petition has been filed seeking Mandamus to declare the action of the respondents in not properly valuing the answer script of the petitioner in the subject of 'Pediatrics' as illegal and arbitrary.

2. Petitioner, a student of MBBS, appeared for final year examinations. It is stated that final year of MBBS course consists of four subjects, namely, Medicine, Pediatrics, Surgery and

Obstetrics/Gynecology. When results were announced, petitioner was found to have secured 161 marks in Medicine, 177 marks in Surgery and 122 marks in Obstetrics/Gynecology, but she could secure only 52 marks in Pediatrics. Dissatisfied with the marks secured by her in Pediatrics, she applied for recounting and personal verification of the answer script and was asked to appear in person for recounting and personal verification on 22-08-2006. She alleges that though she had written correct answers to Question Nos. 6, 10 and 11, they were struck off without awarding any marks.

3. Though no counter affidavit has been filed, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents placed before this Court a copy of the letter dated 11-09-2006 addressed to him by the Joint Registrar (Exams) of Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada, wherein it is stated that the petitioner was satisfied with recounting at the time of verification and she has also signed to the effect "retotalling done, count correct". It is stated that it is not uncommon to award "Less/Nil/Zero" marks when the answers given are irrelevant or extraneous to the given questions. It is further stated that there is no provision in the academic regulations for revaluation of answer scripts.

4. Except the petitioner's own assessment with regard to the correctness of the answers given, there is no other basis. It is to be seen that expectation of students is not the criterion for awarding marks.

It is for the examiners, who are experts in the field, to look into a particular answer and make their own assessment for awarding marks, having regard to the nature of question and the way in which the student answers it. Moreover, the respondent has recounted the marks

at the request of the petitioner and the petitioner has also signed to the effect that she was satisfied with the recounting done by the respondents. In that view of the matter, no direction as sought for can be given.

5. The writ petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

September 13, 2006
MRR